

A Toy Model for Blandford-Znajek Mechanism

Li-Xin Li

Department of Astrophysical Sciences, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544

(February 24, 1999; Revised December 8, 1999)

Abstract

A toy model for the Blandford-Znajek mechanism is investigated: a Kerr black hole with a toroidal electric current residing in a thin disk around the black hole. The toroidal electric current generates a poloidal magnetic field threading the black hole and disk. Due to the interaction of the magnetic field with remote charged particles, the rotation of the black hole and disk induces an electromotive force, which can power an astrophysical load at remote distance. The power of the black hole and disk is calculated. It is found that, for a wide range of parameters specifying the rotation of the black hole and the distribution of the electric current in the disk, the power of the disk exceeds the power of the black hole. The torque provided by the black hole and disk is also calculated. The torque of the disk is comparable to the torque of the black hole. As the disk loses its angular momentum, the mass of the disk gradually drifts towards the black hole and gets accreted. Ultimately the power comes from the gravitational binding energy between the disk and the black hole, as in the standard theory of accretion disk, instead of the rotational energy of the black hole. This suggests that the Blandford-Znajek mechanism may be less efficient in extracting energy from a rotating black hole with a thin disk. The limitations of our simple model and possible

improvements deserved for future work are also discussed.

PACS number(s): 04.70.-s, 97.60.Lf

I. INTRODUCTION

It's well believed that black holes exist in many astrophysical systems, such as in active galactic nuclei (AGNs), centers of galaxies, and some stellar binary systems. For a rotating black hole with an accretion disk, magnetic field threading the black hole and the disk could exist ([1] and references therein). Due to the rotation of the black hole relative to the magnetic field, the black hole's rotational energy can be extracted through the Blandford-Znajek mechanism [2]. Currents in the disk are needed to confine the magnetic field, but without using any mass accretion we can tap the huge rotational energy of the black hole. The Blandford-Znajek process provides a mechanism for extraction of energy from a rotating black hole which is more promising than the Penrose process in practice [3,4]. For a long time the Blandford-Znajek mechanism has been considered as a reasonable process powering the radio jets in AGNs [5,6]. Recently, this mechanism has been invoked in models for gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) where a rotating black hole with an accretion disk (or torus) forms through the collapse of a rotating massive star or the merger of a black hole with a neutron star [7–10]. The Blandford-Znajek mechanism is favorable for these phenomena since ultra-relativistic Lorentz factors are required for jets in AGNs and GRBs and it's believed that very clean energy can be created through the Blandford-Znajek mechanism [11].

However, though some numerical calculations have been taken ([12], [13] and references therein), by now there are no clear answers to such questions as how the magnetic field is generated, how it is distributed, how much energy can be extracted from the black hole and disk, what portion of the extracted energy is attributable to the black hole, and if the energy extracted from the black hole is clean enough. Realistic cases are too complicated, we have very little observational clues.

In this paper, instead of searching for complicated numerical solutions, we consider a semi-analytical toy model to probe the Blandford-Znajek mechanism. The toy model is a Kerr black hole with a toroidal electric current residing in a geometrically thin disk around the Kerr black hole. The toroidal current generates a poloidal magnetic field threading the

black hole and disk. Due to the interaction between the magnetic field and remote charged particles, the rotation of the black hole and disk induces an electromotive force (EMF) on the black hole's horizon and on the disk. This EMF could be the energy source for remote astrophysical loads (such as the jets in AGNs and GRBs). The power and torque provided by the black hole and disk are calculated. It is found that for a wide range of parameters specifying the rotation of the black hole and the distribution of the current density in the disk, the power provided by the disk exceeds the power provided by the black hole. The torque provided by the disk is comparable to the torque provided by the black hole. This agrees with the results in [2,14] and suggests that the Blandford-Znajek mechanism may be less efficient in extracting energy from a rotating black hole for the thin disk case.

Though the case of thin disks is simple for calculation, in real astronomy accretion disks may be geometrically thick and the case of thick disks may be quite different from that of thin disks [5,11,15]. However the simple model presented in the paper gives a complete semi-analytical example: from the generation of magnetic fields to the extraction of energy from the black hole and the disk. The extension to the case of thick disks is extremely interesting and challenging.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL

Realistic cases of a rotating black hole with a disk and magnetic field are likely to be extremely complicated. However, if the magnetic field associated with the black hole has a somewhat poloidal structure, it can be modeled as being generated by some toroidal electric current outside the black hole's horizon. This toroidal electric current most likely resides in the disk around the black hole. Thus here we consider a model of a Kerr black hole with a thin disk in the equatorial plane and there is a distribution of electric current in the disk. The Kerr black hole has mass M , angular momentum Ma [throughout the paper we use the geometric units with $G = c = 1$ and the Boyer-Lindquist coordinates (t, r, θ, ϕ) for Kerr black hole]. Then the angular velocity of the black hole's horizon is

$$\Omega_H = \frac{a}{2Mr_H}, \quad (1)$$

where $r_H = M + \sqrt{M^2 - a^2}$ is the radius of the Kerr black hole's outer horizon ($a^2 \leq M^2$). As usual the disk's angular velocity is taken to be the relativistic Keplerian angular velocity [16]

$$\Omega_D(r) = \left(\frac{M}{r^3}\right)^{1/2} \frac{1}{1 + a \left(\frac{M}{r^3}\right)^{1/2}}. \quad (2)$$

The outer edge of the disk is at $r = r_b$, the inner edge of the disk is taken to be at the innermost stable circular orbit (the “marginally stable” orbit) in the equatorial plane [16]:

$$r_{\text{ms}} = M \left\{ 3 + z_2 - [(3 - z_1)(3 + z_1 + 2z_2)]^{1/2} \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where $z_1 = 1 + (1 - a^2/M^2)^{1/3} \left[(1 + a/M)^{1/3} + (1 - a/M)^{1/3} \right]$ and $z_2 = (3a^2/M^2 + z_1^2)^{1/2}$. (The assumption of a Keplerian disk is valid only if the magnetic field is weak enough [17,18].) The toroidal electric current in the disk has a surface density $J = J(r)$ which is distributed between r_{ms} and $r_b > r_{\text{ms}}$.

The magnetic field generated by a single toroidal electric current at a fixed radius [i.e. the current density $J(r)$ is a delta function] has been well investigated by many authors [19–21]. By linear superposition, the magnetic flux through a surface bounded by a circle with $r = \text{const}$ and $\theta = \text{const}$ is

$$\Psi(r, \theta) = 2\pi A_\phi(r, \theta) = 2\pi \int_{r_{\text{ms}}}^{r_b} J(r') \frac{dA_\phi}{dr'} dr', \quad (4)$$

where A_ϕ is the toroidal component of the electric vector potential, and dA_ϕ/dr' is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dA_\phi}{dr'} = & 2 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \alpha_l^r \left[ra \sin^2 \theta \frac{\Delta}{\Sigma} \frac{1}{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} P_l'(u) P_l(\cos \theta) - a \sin^2 \theta \cos \theta \frac{r^2 + a^2}{\Sigma} P_l(u) P_l'(\cos \theta) \right] \right. \\ & + \alpha_l^i \left[-a^2 \sin^2 \theta \cos \theta \frac{\Delta}{\Sigma} \frac{1}{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} P_l'(u) P_l(\cos \theta) - r \sin^2 \theta \frac{r^2 + a^2}{\Sigma} P_l(u) P_l'(\cos \theta) \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \frac{\Delta \sin^2 \theta}{l(l+1)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} P_l'(u) P_l'(\cos \theta) \right] \right\} \\ & + 2 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \beta_l^r \left[ra \sin^2 \theta \frac{\Delta}{\Sigma} \frac{1}{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} Q_l'(u) P_l(\cos \theta) - a \sin^2 \theta \cos \theta \frac{r^2 + a^2}{\Sigma} Q_l(u) P_l'(\cos \theta) \right] \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \beta_l^i \left[-a^2 \sin^2 \theta \cos \theta \frac{\Delta}{\Sigma} \frac{1}{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} Q'_l(u) P_l(\cos \theta) - r \sin^2 \theta \frac{r^2 + a^2}{\Sigma} Q_l(u) P'_l(\cos \theta) \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{\Delta \sin^2 \theta}{l(l+1)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} Q'_l(u) P'_l(\cos \theta) \right] \Bigg\}, \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta = r^2 - 2Mr + a^2$, $\Sigma = r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta$, $A = (r^2 + a^2)^2 - \Delta a^2 \sin^2 \theta$, $u = (r - M)/\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}$, $P_l(z)$ and $Q_l(z)$ are Legendre functions, and $P'_l(z) = dP_l(z)/dz$, $Q'_l(z) = dQ_l(z)/dz$, and the coefficients α_l^r , α_l^i , β_l^r , and β_l^i are respectively

(1) for $r < r'$, $\beta_l^r = \beta_l^i = 0$ for all l ; but

$$\alpha_l^r = \frac{(2l+1)\pi}{l(l+1)(M^2 - a^2)} \left(\frac{\Sigma'}{A'} \right)^{1/2} \Delta' a P_l(0) Q'_l(u'), \tag{6}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_l^i = & \frac{(2l+1)\pi}{l(l+1)\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} \left(\frac{\Sigma'}{A'} \right)^{1/2} \left[-(r'^2 + a^2) P'_l(0) Q_l(u') \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{\Sigma' \Delta'}{r' l(l+1)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} P'_l(0) Q'_l(u') \right]; \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

(2) for $r > r'$, $\alpha_l^r = \alpha_l^i = 0$ for all l , but

$$\beta_l^r = \frac{(2l+1)\pi}{l(l+1)(M^2 - a^2)} \left(\frac{\Sigma'}{A'} \right)^{1/2} \Delta' a P_l(0) P'_l(u'), \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_l^i = & \frac{(2l+1)\pi}{l(l+1)\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} \left(\frac{\Sigma'}{A'} \right)^{1/2} \left[-(r'^2 + a^2) P'_l(0) P_l(u') \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{\Sigma' \Delta'}{r' l(l+1)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} P'_l(0) P'_l(u') \right]; \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta' = \Delta(r = r')$, $\Sigma' = \Sigma(r = r', \theta = \pi/2) = r'^2$, and $A' = A(r = r', \theta = \pi/2)$. The normal component of the magnetic field in the disk is

$$B_D = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\frac{\Delta}{A} \right)_{\theta=\pi/2}^{1/2} \frac{d\Psi(r, \pi/2)}{dr}. \tag{10}$$

The poloidal magnetic field on the horizon (which is perpendicular to the horizon) is

$$B_H = \frac{1}{2\pi (r_H^2 + a^2) \sin \theta} \frac{d\Psi(r_H, \theta)}{d\theta}. \tag{11}$$

Due to the interaction of the magnetic field with remote charged particles, the rotation of the black hole and disk induces EMFs on the horizon and in the disk [22]. The total EMF on the black hole is

$$\mathcal{E}_H = \frac{1}{2\pi} \Omega_H \Psi(r_H), \quad (12)$$

where $\Psi(r_H) = \Psi(r_H, \pi/2)$ is the magnetic flux through the northern hemi-sphere of black hole's horizon. The total EMF in the disk is

$$\mathcal{E}_D = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{r_{ms}}^{r_c} \Omega_D d\Psi(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[\Omega_D(r_c) \Psi(r_c) - \Omega_D(r_{ms}) \Psi(r_{ms}) - \int_{r_{ms}}^{r_c} \Psi \frac{d\Omega_D}{dr} dr \right], \quad (13)$$

where $\Psi(r) = \Psi(r, \pi/2)$, $r_c < r_b$ is the radius within which the disk's energy is available. (As in the case of the Sun, the open magnetic field lines may emerge from only a small fraction of the disk surface [23]. So we should choose $r_c \ll r_b$ in practice.) These EMFs could be the energy source powering a remote astrophysical load. The black hole, the disk, and the remote astrophysical load form an electric circuit in series. (Alternative type of circuits are possible, see the discussions in Sec. IV.) The circuit has two batteries — one is the Kerr black hole with EMF $\mathcal{E}_H$ and internal resistance Z_H (which is of several hundred ohms), the other is the disk with EMF $\mathcal{E}_D$ and negligible internal resistance (i.e. the disk's resistance is supposed to be $\ll Z_H$) — and a resistor which is the astrophysical load with resistance $Z_A \equiv \alpha Z_H$. Suppose $\mathcal{E}_D$ and $\mathcal{E}_H$ generate a (single) poloidal electric current $I = (\mathcal{E}_H + \mathcal{E}_D) / (Z_H + Z_A)$, which flows along the circuit from the disk to the black hole, from the black hole up to the remote astrophysical load along the symmetry axis, from the remote astrophysical load down to the disk at the circle with radius r_c ($r_{ms} < r_c < r_b$) in the disk. The power provided to the remote astrophysical load, $P = I^2 Z_A$, is sensitive to the ratio $\alpha = Z_A / Z_H$. P reaches its maximum at $\alpha = 1$. $\alpha = 1$ is called the impedance matching condition [22]. Define $\xi = \mathcal{E}_D / \mathcal{E}_H$, the ratio of the power of the disk $P_D \equiv -dE_D/dt = I \mathcal{E}_D$ to the effective power of the black hole $P_H \equiv -dE_H/dt = I \mathcal{E}_H - I^2 Z_H$ (where E_D is the energy of the disk, E_H is the energy of the black hole; $P_D + P_H = P$) is

$$\frac{P_D}{P_H} = \frac{(1 + \alpha)\xi}{\alpha - \xi}. \quad (14)$$

If $\xi \geq \alpha$, the power of the black hole is negative or zero (while the power of the disk is always positive). If $\xi_{cr} < \xi < \alpha$, where $\xi_{cr} \equiv \alpha / (2 + \alpha)$, the power of the black hole is positive but

less than the power of the disk, i.e. $0 < P_H < P_D$. If $\xi \leq \xi_{\text{cr}}$, the power of the black hole is bigger than the power of the disk. Thus, the parameter ξ gives a sensible measure of the relative importance of the disk's power and the black hole's power. If $\xi > \xi_{\text{cr}}$, the disk's power dominates. From the definition of ξ_{cr} , $\xi_{\text{cr}} < 1$ always. (For the case of $P = P_m$ i.e. $\alpha = 1$, we have $\xi_{\text{cr}} = 1/3$.) Therefore, if $\xi > 1$, we can conclude that the disk's power always dominates the black hole's power.

The torque produced by the black hole is

$$T_H \equiv -\frac{dL_H}{dt} = \frac{I}{2\pi} \Psi(r_H), \quad (15)$$

where $L_H = Ma$ is the angular momentum of the black hole. The torque produced by the disk is

$$T_D \equiv -\frac{dL_D}{dt} = \frac{I}{2\pi} [\Psi(r_c) - \Psi(r_{\text{ms}})], \quad (16)$$

where L_D is the angular momentum of the disk, $\Psi(r_c) - \Psi(r_{\text{ms}})$ is the magnetic flux through the disk inside the circle with $r = r_c$. The ratio of T_D to T_H is

$$\eta \equiv \frac{T_D}{T_H} = \frac{\Psi(r_c) - \Psi(r_{\text{ms}})}{\Psi(r_H)}. \quad (17)$$

III. SOLUTIONS OF THE MODEL

If we do not care about the absolute values of the power and torque of the black hole and disk, the problem is “self-similar” in the sense that the mass of the black hole and the absolute magnitude of the magnetic field are not important for us. Then, we are left with three adjustable parameters: (1) a/M , where M is the mass of the black hole and Ma is the angular momentum of the black hole; (2) the shape of the surface current function $J = J(r)$; and (3) r_c/M , where r_c is the radius within which the disk's energy is available. We take $J = J_0(r/r_{\text{ms}})^{-n}$, where n is a positive dimensionless number, J_0 is the magnitude of J at the inner edge of the disk. The radius r_c is usually thought to be several times larger than r_H [14] but much smaller than r_b [23]. Thus we take $r_c = r_{\text{ms}} + \kappa r_H$, where κ is a positive

constant which has magnitude ~ 1 . Then the three adjustable dimensionless parameters are a/M , n , and κ (the value of J_0 is unimportant for us). Clearly, if the magnetic field in the disk, B_D , keeps the same sign everywhere (no reversal of magnetic field), the larger the radius r_c is, larger the power of the disk is, and thus less efficient the Blandford-Znajek mechanism is. To avoid overestimating the power of the disk by choosing a large r_c , in our numerical solutions we take $\kappa = 0.2$. Even for such a small value of κ , we will see that the disk's power still dominates the black hole's power. Thus, our numerical calculation is taken for $\kappa = 0.2$ and a series of values of a/M from 0.1 to 0.99, n from 1 to 3 (For a stationary Newtonian disk we have $n = 1$ [24]). (For $n \geq 1$, the results are insensitive to the value of r_b/M for sufficiently large r_b .)

During the numerical calculation, the summation $\sum_l$ over Legendre functions [19] is truncated at $l_{\max} = 10$. [For a realistic disk with thickness $\Delta\theta$, the summation over l should be truncated at $l_{\max} \approx (\Delta\theta)^{-1}$.] The results are shown in Fig. 1 – Fig. 4. The results are insensitive to n . Fig. 1 shows the dimensionless parameter $\xi = \mathcal{E}_D/\mathcal{E}_H$, which measures the relative importance of the power of the disk to the power of the black hole. For the impedance matching case with $Z_A = Z_H$, the power of the disk always dominates the power of the black hole. For example, for $a/M = 0.9$ and $n = 2$, we have $\xi = \mathcal{E}_D/\mathcal{E}_H = 0.68$, $P_D/P_H = 4.3$ [Eq. (14) with $\alpha = 1$]. Fig. 2 shows the ratio P_D/P_H for the case with $n = 2$ and $Z_A = Z_H$. For $a/M < 0.54$, the black hole's effective power P_H is negative (i.e. $I^2 Z_H > \mathcal{E}_H$; P_D is always positive since we have assumed $Z_D = 0$); for $a/M > 0.54$, both P_H and P_D are positive but $P_D > P_H$. Thus the disk's power dominates the black hole's power. Fig. 3 shows the dimensionless parameter $\eta = T_D/T_H$, which measures the relative importance of the torque of the disk to the torque of the black hole. The torque of the disk is comparable to the torque of the black hole. Fig. 4 shows the normal components of the poloidal magnetic field on the horizon and disk, which use $B_0 = J_0/c$ as unit. The magnetic field is most strong at the inner edge of the disk.

IV. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

From the simple model presented in the paper we have got some insight into the Blandford-Znajek mechanism. Since the electric current generating the magnetic field must reside outside the black hole and most likely resides in a disk around the black hole, as described in our thin disk model, the strength of the magnetic field at the inner edge of the disk should be bigger than that on the horizon [13,14]. The solutions of our model show that this is true. Though the average strength of the magnetic field in the whole disk could be smaller than that on the horizon, the local strength of the magnetic field at the inner edge of the disk could be much stronger. In fact, in our solutions $B_D(r = r_{ms})/B_H(\theta = 0)$ has never got smaller than 1. Our solutions show that, for a wide range of parameters specifying the model considered in the paper, the power of the disk is stronger than the power of the black hole. The torque provided by the disk is comparable to the torque provided by the black hole. These results are physically plausible since (1) the electric current generating the magnetic field resides in the disk and thus the magnetic field at the inner edge of the disk (where the current density is most strong) should be stronger than that on the black hole's horizon; (2) rapidly rotating black holes exclude stationary and axisymmetric magnetic fields [25], as seen from Fig. 4 (left diagram); (3) the disk has a surface area larger than that of the horizon and thus the magnetic flux through the disk could be larger than that through the black hole; (4) the disk is a perfect conductor with a negligible resistance while the black hole's horizon has a significant internal resistance of several hundred ohms which consumes the power of the black hole and disk.

For the model considered in the paper the angular momentum and energy lost from the disk are important. As the disk loses its angular momentum, the mass of the disk gradually drifts towards the black hole and gets accreted. Ultimately the power at the remote load comes from the gravitational binding energy between the disk and the black hole, as in the standard theory of accretion disk, instead of the rotational energy of the black hole. This implies that the Blandford-Znajek mechanism is not likely to be efficient in extracting energy

from a rotating black hole with a geometrically thin disk and magnetic field.

Though the simple model is simple and convenient for calculations and we believe that some essential features for the Blandford-Znajek mechanism have been included, the limitations must also be emphasized: (1) We have assumed that the disk is geometrically thin. But in real cases this may not be true, especially for subcritical accretion. There could be an alternative type of models where, in the limiting case, poloidal flux is confined by and excluded from a funnel formed by an ion torus with ADAF or ADIOS solution where the disk's power is manifestly zero [5,11,26]. (2) We have neglected the magnetic coupling between the black hole and the disk. In fact there could be strong coupling between the disk and the hole with the former acquiring energy from the work done by the latter [1,26,27], which might lead that some of the power of the disk effectively comes from the rotation of the black hole [18]. In particular, loops of closed lines connecting the disk with the hole could exist and play important roles in transportation of angular momentum and energy. For a fast rotating black hole ($a/M > 0.36$) with a relativistic Keplerian disk, the rotation of the disk is slower than the rotation of the black hole. So the closed magnetic field lines will transfer angular momentum from the hole to the disk and reverse the accretion flow [26]. Accompanying the angular momentum, energy will also be transferred from the black hole to the disk via Poynting flux. Then for the remote load the energy directly extracted from the black hole is decreased, but it may be compensated by the energy extracted from the disk. We can imagine that with suitable conditions a steady state could exist when the power from the disk balances the energy flux from the black hole to the disk and then all the power of the disk effectively comes from the spin of the black hole. (3) We have supposed that the poloidal magnetic field is generated purely by the toroidal currents in the disk. By doing so we have neglected the effect of the currents induced by the charges in the magnetosphere. This allows to calculate the poloidal magnetic field from the potential instead of solving the complicated Grad-Shafranov equation. With this approach the back-reaction of the induced charges and currents cannot be taken into account, but it is particularly useful for semi-analytical investigations. (4) We have modeled the toroidal magnetic field with

a global poloidal current loop flowing through the black hole, the accretion disk, and the remote load. This allows us to conveniently compare the power of the black hole and the power of the disk since they have the same unique current. The realistic case will be more complicated since poloidal currents flow into and out of the black hole and the disk diversely at all radius. An alternative type of current loops is that the poloidal current associated with black hole and the poloidal current associated with the disk flow separately, i.e. we have two distinct poloidal current loops. In this case the black hole and the disk have different loads and it's hard to compare their powers. However if the disk and the black hole have comparable EMFs and the impedance matching conditions are satisfied for both the hole's circuit and the disk's circuit, the power of the disk will exceed the power of the black hole since the disk has much smaller internal resistance. But in this case, even the black hole's power is only a small faction of the total power, it can still be important in practice if the energy from the black hole is very clean and not mixed with the energy from the disk [11].

In conclusions, for the simple model considered in the paper we have shown that the power of the disk dominates over the power of the black hole. This suggests that the Blandford-Znajek mechanism may be less efficient for extraction of energy from black hole with a thin disk. However, due to many simplifications we have made for the model, improvements are required for getting more thorough understanding of the Blandford-Znajek mechanism. Especially the generalization to the case of thick disk deserves considerations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I acknowledge Bohdan Paczyński, Jeremy Goodman, Richard Gott, David Meier, Hyun Kyu Lee, Gerry Brown, Ralph Wijers, and Jiri Bicak for many helpful discussions. I am very grateful to the referee Roger Blandford for many valuable comments and suggestions. This work was supported by NASA Astrophysical Theory Grant NAG5-2796.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. S. Thorne, R. H. Price, and D. A. Macdonald, *Black Holes: The Membrane Paradigm* (Yale University Press, Yale, 1986).
- [2] R. D. Blandford and R. L. Znajek, Mon. Not. Roy. Ast. Soc **179**, 433 (1977).
- [3] R. Penrose, Rev. Nuovo Cimento **1**, 252 (1969).
- [4] B. Carter, in *General Relativity: an Einstein Centenary Survey*, edited by S. W. Hawking and W. Israel (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979), P. 294.
- [5] M. J. Rees, E. S. Phinney, M. C. Begelman, and R. D. Blandford, Nature **295**, 17 (1982).
- [6] M. C. Begelman, R. D. Blandford, and M. J. Rees, Rev. Mod. Phys. **56**, 255 (1984).
- [7] B. Paczyński, in *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.*, 688, *Proc. Relativistic Astrophysics and Particle Physics*, ed. C. W. Ackerloff & M. A. Srednicki, 321 (1993).
- [8] S. E. Wooseley, Astrophys. Journ. **405**, 273 (1993).
- [9] B. Paczyński, Astrophys. Journ. **494**, L45 (1998).
- [10] H. K. Lee, R. A. M. J. Wijers, and G. E. Brown, preprint astro-ph/9906213.
- [11] R. D. Blandford, private communications.
- [12] D. A. Macdonald, Mon. Not. Roy. Ast. Soc. **211**, 313 (1984).
- [13] P. Ghosh and M. A. Abramowicz, Mon. Not. Roy. Ast. Soc. **292**, 887 (1997).
- [14] M. Livio, G. L. Ogilvie, and J. E. Pringle, Astrophys. Journ. **512**, 100 (1999).
- [15] P. J. Armitage and P. Natarajan, Astrophys. Journ. **523**, L7 (1999).
- [16] I. D. Novikov and K. S. Thorne, in *Black Holes*, edited by C. DeWitt and B. S. DeWitt (Gordon and Breach, NY, 1973), P. 343.

- [17] J. Krolik, *Astrophys. Journ.* **515**, L73 (1999).
- [18] D. Meier, private communications.
- [19] R. L. Znajek, *Mon. Not. Roy. Ast. Soc.* **182**, 639 (1978).
- [20] J. A. Petterson, *Phys. Rev. D* **12**, 2218 (1975).
- [21] B. Linet, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **12**, 839 (1979).
- [22] D. Macdonald and K. S. Thorne, *Mon. Not. Roy. Ast. Soc.* **198**, 345 (1982).
- [23] R. D. Blandford and D. G. Payne, *Mon. Not. Roy. Ast. Soc.* **199**, 883 (1999).
- [24] R. D. Blandford, *Mon. Not. Roy. Ast. Soc.* **176**, 465 (1976).
- [25] J. Bicak and V. Janis, *Mon. Not. Roy. Ast. Soc.* **212**, 899 (1985).
- [26] R. D. Blandford, preprint astro-ph/9902001.
- [27] C. F. Gammie, *Astrophys. Journ.* **522**, L57 (1999).

FIGURES

FIG. 1. The variation of the ratio of disk's EMF, $\mathcal{E}_D$, to the black hole's EMF, $\mathcal{E}_H$, with respect to the parameter a/M . The curves are plotted from $a/M = 0.1$ to $a/M = 0.99$ for different values of n : 1, 2, and 3 [see the labels at the left end of each curve; the surface current density in the disk is $J \propto r^{-n}$]. The long dashed line represents $\mathcal{E}_D/\mathcal{E}_H = 1$, the short dashed line represents $\mathcal{E}_D/\mathcal{E}_H = 1/3$ which is the critical value for the most efficient case with $Z_A = Z_H$ (where Z_H is the electric resistance of the black hole, Z_A is the electric resistance of the remote astrophysical load). The parameter $\mathcal{E}_D/\mathcal{E}_H$ measures the relative importance of the power of the disk to the power of the black hole [see Eq. (14) in the text and the discussions below it]. If $\mathcal{E}_D/\mathcal{E}_H > 1$, the power of the disk always dominates the power of the black hole. If $\mathcal{E}_D/\mathcal{E}_H > 1/3$, the power of the disk dominates the power of the black hole in the most efficient case with $Z_A = Z_H$.

FIG. 2. The ratio of the disk's power P_D to the black hole's power P_H for the case with $n = 2$ and $Z_A = Z_H$. The vertical dashed line shows the position (where $a/M = 0.54$) for $P_H = I\mathcal{E}_H - I^2 Z_H = 0$. For $a/M < 0.54$, the black hole's power P_H is negative; for $a/M > 0.54$, the black hole's power P_H is positive but less than the disk's power P_D . The shaded region ($0 \leq P_D/P_H < 1$) shows the case when the Blandford-Znajek mechanism is efficient, i.e. when the black hole's power dominates the disk's power. In the unshaded region, the disk's power dominates the black hole's power, the Blandford-Znajek mechanism is less efficient. None of the models is in the shaded zone, i.e. the B-Z mechanism is less efficient in all models considered in the paper.

FIG. 3. The variation of the ratio of the disk's torque, T_D , to the black hole's torque, T_H , with respect to the parameter a/M . The curves are plotted from $a/M = 0.1$ to $a/M = 0.99$ for different values of n : 1, 2, and 3 (see the labels at the end of each curve). The dashed line represents $T_D/T_H = 1$. If $T_D/T_H > 1$, the torque of the disk dominates the torque of the black hole; if $T_D/T_H < 1$, the torque of the black hole dominates the torque of the disk.

FIG. 4. The left diagram shows the distribution of the magnetic field B_H on the black hole's horizon for $n = 1$ and different values of a/M . The right diagram shows the distribution of the normal component of the magnetic field B_D on the disk for $n = 1$ and different values of a/M , drawn from $r = r_{ms}(a)$ to $r = 8M$. The inner edge of the disk is at $r = r_{ms}(a)$, as denoted with the thick dots at the left end of each curve.







